

REMARKS

The present amendment is intended to place the present application in condition for allowance.

By this Response, claims 1 and 11 are amended, claim 8 has been canceled and new claims 16-17 have been added. Thus, claims 1-7 and 9-17 are now pending in the application.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,945,759). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended herein, independent claim 11 recites a dynamoelectric machine comprising, among other things, a stator core, a rotor, at least one capacitor and two endshields. At least one of the endshields has a portion which extends to a longitudinal position within the stator core and at least one of the endshields has a cavity for holding the capacitor.

Tanaka fails to disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. Even assuming arguendo, the Patent Office's contention that Tanaka discloses an endshield having a portion which extends to a longitudinal position within a stator core, Tanaka does not disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. Indeed, Tanaka does not even mention a capacitor. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to anticipate claim 11 and claims 12-15 which depend therefrom.

Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoda et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,225,715). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended herein, independent claim 1 recites a dynamoelectric machine comprising, among other things, at least one capacitor and at least one endshield having a cavity for holding the capacitor. As noted on page 4 of the Office Action, Hoda does not disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. Accordingly, Hoda fails to anticipate claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 9-10 which depend therefrom.

As noted above, claim 11 recites a dynamoelectric machine comprising, among other things, an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. As shown above with respect to claim 1, Hoda fails to disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. Accordingly, Hoda fails to anticipate claim 11 and claims 12-15 which depend therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoda et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,225,715) in view of Matsushita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,707,219). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Although claim 8 has been canceled, Applicant will explain why claims 1-15 are clearly distinguishable over Hoda and Matsushita.

As amended herein independent claims 1 and 11 recite a dynamoelectric machine comprising, among other things, at least one capacitor and at least one endshield having a cavity for holding the capacitor. As noted in the Office Action, Hoda does not disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. Instead, the

Patent Office relies on Matsushita to disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor.

Applicant respectfully submits that a §103 rejection of claims 1 and 11 based on Hoda in view of Matsushita is improper because there is no motivation to modify Hoda to include an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. Specifically, Hoda discloses a motor 1 with a built-in sensor 23 which detects the position or rotational speed of a rotor 3. The sensor 23 includes a fixed portion 23a that is fitted in a step portion 11a of a frame 11. Even assuming, arguendo, that the frame 11 is an endshield, Hoda provides no motivation to modify because Hoda is solely concerned with a motor having a built-in sensor for detecting rotor position and speed. Indeed, even when discussing suggested modifications to the motor 1, Hoda makes no mention of modifying the frame 11. Instead, Hoda suggests modifying the motor 1 to replace the sensor with a bearing or to replace the sensor 23 with another type of sensor, such as an optical encoder. See column 4 lines 38-48. Hoda simply does not provide any motivation to modify the frame 11 to include a cavity for holding a capacitor.

Furthermore, even if there were a motivation to modify, Matsushita does not disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. The Patent Office contends that column 1 lines 5-12 and figures 3A-B of Matsushita disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Instead, column 1 lines 5-12 merely disclose that the invention relates to a small-sized motor wherein a capacitor is attached to a case cover. This part of the reference does not disclose whether the case cover is an endshield or whether the case cover includes a cavity for holding the capacitor.

With respect to figures 3A-B, Matsushita discloses an interior view and a cross-sectional view, respectively, of a case cover for a motor. These figures disclose a printed circuit board 12 mounted to the case cover and a chip capacitor 15 attached to the board 12. See column 4 lines 12-13 and figures 3A-B. Even assuming, arguendo, that the case cover is an endshield, Matsushita does not disclose an endshield having a cavity for holding a capacitor because the capacitor 15 is merely attached to the board 12.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 9-10 which depend therefrom, and claim 11 and claims 12-15 which depend therefrom, are clearly distinguishable over Hoda and Matsushita.

NEW CLAIMS 16-17


By this Amendment, new claims 16-17 have been added. New independent claim 16 recites an integrated starter generator for an automotive vehicle comprising, among other things, a switched reluctance machine. The art cited by the Patent Office fails to disclose a switch reluctance machine or an integrated starter generator. For example, Tanaka relates to a stepper motor for image processing machines; Hoda relates to a hybrid motor, which relies on permanent magnet torque and reluctance torque; and Matsushita merely relates to a small-sized motor. Accordingly, these references fail to disclose a switch reluctance machine, which relies on reluctance torque only. Thus, claim 16 is clearly distinguishable over the art of record. Because claim 17 depends from claim 16, such claim is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-27-05

By: 
Michael J. Thomas
Reg. No. 39,857

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, MO 63105
(314) 726-7500